



0000119334

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

KRISTIN K. MAYES
Chairman

GARY PIERCE
Commissioner

PAUL NEWMAN
Commissioner

SANDRA D. KENNEDY
Commissioner

BOB STUMP
Commissioner

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

NOV -8 2010

DOCKETED BY

ne

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
OF ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE
COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF AN
INCREASE IN THE 2010 ENERGY
EFFICIENCY PLAN FUNDS

DOCKET NO. E-01345A-08-0172

DECISION NO. 71960ORDER

Open Meeting
November 4, 2010
Phoenix, Arizona

BY THE COMMISSION:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Arizona Public Service Company ("APS" or "the Company") provides electric service within portions of Arizona, pursuant to authority granted by the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission").

2. APS provides service in the counties of Apache, Cochise, Coconino, Gila, La Paz, Maricopa, Navajo, Pima, Pinal, Yavapai and Yuma. The Company services over 1.1 million customers in Arizona, including approximately 984,000 Residential and 120,000 Commercial customers.

3. On September 27, 2010, APS filed an application for approval of an increase in the 2010 Energy Efficiency Implementation Plan Funds. An increase of \$3,000,000 was requested for the Residential Existing Homes Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning Efficiency ("R-HVAC") program, in order to accommodate unexpectedly high levels of customer demand, and to avoid suspension of the program once the current budget is exhausted in mid-November 2010.

Decision No. _____

1 4. The R-HVAC program consists of: (i) Residential HVAC, including air
2 conditioning rebates and Duct Test and Repair; and (ii) Home Performance with Energy Star
3 (“HPwES”). Residential HVAC promotes energy efficient equipment and a Quality Installation
4 measure designed to maximize HVAC operating efficiency. HPwES¹ promotes a whole house
5 approach to energy efficiency, beginning with a \$99 comprehensive home energy assessment.
6 HPwES identifies potential energy efficiency measures, such as air sealing, insulation, shade
7 screens, faucet aerators, and low flow showerheads, and provides homeowners with information
8 on APS energy efficiency rebates and access to financing.

9 Transfers Between Programs

10 5. In addition to the \$3,000,000 requested in the application, the Company plans to
11 transfer \$846,000 to the R-HVAC program from the Residential New Construction and Residential
12 Refrigerator Recycling programs. Both programs are now projected to spend well below their
13 originally projected budgets², and Decision No. 68648 includes a provision to allow funding
14 transfers from less-active to more-active APS Residential programs.

15 6. Decision No. 68648 states that APS should be limited to transferring a maximum of
16 25 percent of budgeted funds among “the New Construction Program, the HVAC Efficiency
17 Program, and the Consumer Products Program per calendar year.” The Refrigerator Recycling
18 program was not in existence at the time of Decision No. 68468, and so is not listed as one of the
19 Residential programs allowed to transfer budgeted funds. For purposes of clarification, and to
20 facilitate the appropriate allocation of resources, Staff has recommended that APS be allowed to
21 transfer budgeted funds among all Residential programs, with the exception of the Low-Income
22 program. Staff has also recommended that the amount transferred out of any individual program
23 not exceed 25 percent of that program’s budgeted funds per calendar year.

24 ...

25 ...

26 Proposed Increase in 2010 Energy Efficiency Implementation Plan Funds

27 ¹ The HPwES program component was approved by the Commission in Decision No. 71460, on January 26, 2010.

28 ² The Refrigerator Recycling program is still ramping up and participation in the New Construction program is lower than projected due to conditions in the Arizona housing market.

Proposed Increase in 2010 Energy Efficiency Implementation Plan Funds

7. Budget. The original and proposed budgets for the R-HVAC program are listed below, by spending category, in Table 1. Table 2 provides the percentage of the proposed budget allocated to each spending category:

Table 1

Category	Original Budget	Proposed Budget	Difference
Rebates and Incentives	\$3,519,000	\$6,875,000	\$3,356,000
Training/Technical Assistance	\$88,000	\$220,000	\$132,000
Consumer Education	\$279,000	\$229,000	\$(50,000)
Program Implementation	\$1,200,000	\$1,808,000	\$608,000
Program Marketing	\$598,000	\$473,000	\$(125,000)
Planning and Administration	\$223,000	\$102,000	\$(121,000)
Total	\$5,907,000	\$9,707,000 ³	\$3,800,000

Table 2

Category	Proposed Budget	Percentage of Total Proposed Budget
Rebates and Incentives	\$6,875,000	70.8%
Training/Technical Assistance	\$220,000	2.3%
Consumer Education	\$229,000	2.4%
Program Implementation	\$1,808,000	18.6%
Program Marketing	\$473,000	4.9%
Planning and Administration	\$102,000	1.0%
Total	\$9,707,000 ⁴	100%

8. Proposed Changes. The proposed increase in the R-HVAC program budget is driven by participation levels that have been well above projected levels. APS planned for 8,000 Air Conditioning and Duct Test/Repair rebates, but now estimates that 15,000 will be paid; 1,000 energy assessments were planned for, but over 1,700 are likely to be completed during the current year.

³ Includes both the proposed \$3,000,000 increase in funding and the \$846,000 transfer from other Residential programs.

⁴ Includes both the proposed \$3,000,000 increase in funding and the \$846,000 transfer from other Residential programs.

9. With respect to individual budget categories: The largest dollar increases have been proposed for Incentives and Implementation, categories heavily impacted by high participation. Training and Technical Assistance costs are also projected to be higher, since more contractors are taking part in the training than originally anticipated, but this still represents only 2.3 percent of the proposed budget. Some program costs have also decreased. Consumer Education and Marketing costs are lower because customer awareness is good and participation is high, lessening the need for spending in these areas. Planning and Administration costs are lower because overhead has been spread over more programs than in 2009, making per participant program costs lower than expected.

10. Impact of Program Suspension. In its application, the Company indicates that it will be forced to suspend the R-HVAC program in mid-November unless the Commission approves an increase to the budget. APS describes the R-HVAC program as "a critical component of the Company's DSM portfolio and . . . one of the most popular energy efficiency programs APS offers to its customers." The Company states that suspension of the program would "cripple the Company's efforts to meet the 2010 MWh savings goals," estimating that 1,500 MWh in net annual savings for 2010 would be lost if the program is suspended in November and December. In addition, according to the application, a suspension would also confuse APS customers and have a negative impact on a program that has experienced significant improvement in participation.

11. Another consideration cited by APS is that the HPwES measure is a key component of ARRA⁵-funded home retrofit programs for several Arizona cities, and that suspension would impact the ability of these cities to utilize ARRA funding. The City of Phoenix "Energize Phoenix" program and a City of Avondale ARRA-funded program are cited as examples of city programs that could be impacted by a suspension.

12. Bill Impacts and Impact to the Performance Incentive. The proposed \$3,000,000 increase would result in a bill impact, from the higher budget, of \$0.127 per month, or \$1.53 per

⁵ American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

1 year, based on average monthly Residential usage. An additional potential impact would be an
2 increase in the Performance Incentive, which would, in turn, increase the bill impact. Under the
3 Settlement Agreement with APS, the Performance Incentive is based on the Company's
4 achievements relative to its Energy Efficiency Goals, with that amount capped by set percentages
5 of the program costs. The level of energy savings projected for 2010 means that, in effect, the cap
6 determines the amount of the Performance Incentive. The Company estimates that increasing
7 spending for the R-HVAC program by the requested \$3,000,000 would result in a \$420,000
8 increase in the Performance Incentive, potentially bringing the total monthly bill impact to \$0.145,
9 and the annual impact to \$1.74, based on average monthly Residential usage.⁶

10 13. Timing. APS states that there would be no bill impact from the proposed increase
11 until 2012, when DSM over- or under-collections for 2010 would be trued-up.

12 14. Cost-Effectiveness. The measures that are a part of the R-HVAC program were
13 previously reviewed and determined to be cost-effective. It should be noted, however, that the
14 proposed budget changes would significantly decrease per-unit program costs, likely resulting in
15 an improved benefit-cost ratio for the program.

16 15. Analysis and Recommendations. Based on spending through August 2010, Staff
17 has estimated that the original \$5,907,000 budget is likely to be exhausted during October 2010,
18 even taking into account transfers from other Residential programs. Staff has recommended that
19 the Commission approve the requested increase because suspension of the R-HVAC program due
20 to lack of funds is likely to depress program participation and significantly limit energy savings.

21 Summary of Recommendations

- 22 • Staff has recommended that APS be allowed to transfer budgeted funds among all
23 Residential programs, with the exception of the Low-Income program.
- 24 • Staff has recommended that the amount transferred out of any individual program
25 budget not exceed 25 percent of that program's budgeted funds per calendar year.
- 26 • Staff has recommended that the increase to the Residential Existing Home Heating,
27 Ventilation and Air Conditioning program component of the 2010 Energy Efficiency
28 Implementation Plan Funds be approved.

⁶ This estimate is based on the assumption that energy savings and program spending conform to projections.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1
2 1. APS is an Arizona public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV,
3 Section 2, of the Arizona Constitution.

4 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over APS and over the subject matter of the
5 application.

6 3. The Commission, having reviewed the application and Staff's Memorandum dated
7 October 21, 2010, concludes that it is in the public interest to approve the increase in funds for the
8 APS Residential Existing Homes Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning Efficiency program
9 component of the 2010 Energy Efficiency Implementation Plan.

ORDER

10
11 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the funding increase for the Arizona Public Service
12 Company Residential Existing Homes Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning Efficiency
13 program component of the 2010 Energy Efficiency Implementation Plan be approved, as discussed
14 herein.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Arizona Public Service Company be allowed to transfer
16 budgeted funds among all Residential programs, with the exception of the Low-Income program.

17 ...

18 ...

19 ...

20 ...

21 ...

22 ...

23 ...

24 ...

25 ...

26 ...

27 ...

28 ...


1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the amount transferred out of any individual program
2 budget not exceed 25 percent of that program's budgeted funds per calendar year.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.


4
5 **BY THE ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

6 


7 CHAIRMAN

8 


9 COMMISSIONER

10 

11 COMMISSIONER


12 

13 COMMISSIONER

14 

15 COMMISSIONER

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, ERNEST G. JOHNSON,
17 Executive Director of the Arizona Corporation Commission,
18 have hereunto, set my hand and caused the official seal of
19 this Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of
20 Phoenix, this 5 day of November, 2010.

21 

22 ERNEST G. JOHNSON
23 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

24 DISSENT: _____

25 DISSENT: _____

26 SMO:JMK:lhmfJFW

SERVICE LIST FOR: ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY
DOCKET NO. E-01345A-08-0172

Mr. Thomas Mumaw
Arizona Public Service Company
Post Office Box 53999
Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3999

Mr. Gary Yaquinto
Arizona Investment Council
2100 North Central Avenue, Suite 210
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Mr. Michael L. Kurtz
Mr. Kurt J. Boehm
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Mr. Jay Moyes
Ms. Karen E. Nally
Moyes Storey
1850 North Central Avenue, Suite 1100
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-0001

Mr. C. Webb Crockett
Mr. Patrick J. Black
Fennemore Craig, P.C.
3003 North Central Avenue, Suite 2600
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2913

Mr. Jeffrey J. Woner
K. R. Saline & Associates, PLC
160 North Pasadena, Suite 101
Mesa, Arizona 85201

Mr. Lawrence V. Robertson, Jr.
Attorney at Law
Post Office Box 1448
Tubac, Arizona 85646

Mr. Scott Canty
General Counsel
The Hopi Tribe
Post Office Box 123
Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Mr. Michael A. Curtis
Mr. William P. Sullivan
Curtis, Goodwin, Sullivan,
Udall & Schwab, P.L.C.
501 East Thomas Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3205

Ms. Cynthia Zwick
1940 East Luke Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

Mr. Timothy M. Hogan
Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest
202 East McDowell Road, Suite 153
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Mr. Nicholas J. Enoch
Lubin & Enoch, P.C.
349 North Fourth Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Mr. Daniel Pozefsky
Chief Counsel
RUCO
1110 West Washington Street, Suite 220
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Mr. John William Moore, Jr.
7321 North 16th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85020

Mr. Michael M. Grant
Gallagher & Kennedy
2575 East Camelback Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225

Ms. Karen S. White
Air Force Utility Litigation &
Negotiation Team
AFLOA/JACL-UTL
139 Barnes Drive
Tyndall AFB, Florida 32403

1 Mr. Douglas V. Fant
Law Offices of
2 Douglas V. Fant
3 3655 West Anthem Drive, Suite A-109
PMB 411
4 Anthem, Arizona 85068

5 Ms. Barbara Wyllie-Pecora
27458 North 129th Drive
6 Peoria, Arizona 85383

7 Mr. Carlo Dal Monte
Catalyst Paper Company
8 65 Front Street, Suite 201
9 Nanaimo, BC V9R 5H9

10 Mr. Steve Morrison
SCA Tissue North America
11 14005 West Old Highway 66
12 Bellemont, Arizona 86015

13 Mr. Steven M. Olea
Director, Utilities Division
14 Arizona Corporation Commission
15 1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

16 Ms. Janice M. Alward
17 Chief Counsel, Legal Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
18 1200 West Washington Street
19 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28